



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/577,942	12/18/2006	Pierre Weiss	P08919US00/BAS	5251
881 7590 02/26/2010 STITES & HARBISON PLLC 1199 NORTH FAIRFAX STREET SUITE 900 ALEXANDRIA, VA 22314			EXAMINER HANLEY, SUSAN MARIE	
			ART UNIT 1651	PAPER NUMBER
			MAIL DATE 02/26/2010	DELIVERY MODE PAPER

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

Examiner-Initiated Interview Summary		Application No. 10/577,942	Applicant(s) WEISS ET AL.
		Examiner SUSAN HANLEY	Art Unit 1651

All Participants:

(1) SUSAN HANLEY.

(2) Aaron Schulman.

Date of Interview: 24 February 2010

Type of Interview:

☒ Telephonic
☐ Video Conference
☐ Personal (Copy given to: ☐ Applicant ☐ Applicant's representative)

Exhibit Shown or Demonstrated: ☐ Yes ☒ No
 If Yes, provide a brief description:

Status of Application: amended

(3) ____.

(4) ____.

Time: 3:00

Part I.

Rejection(s) discussed:
none

Claims discussed:
1-4

Prior art documents discussed:
none

Part II.

SUBSTANCE OF INTERVIEW DESCRIBING THE GENERAL NATURE OF WHAT WAS DISCUSSED:
See Continuation Sheet

Part III.

☐ It is not necessary for applicant to provide a separate record of the substance of the interview, since the interview directly resulted in the allowance of the application. The examiner will provide a written summary of the substance of the interview in the Notice of Allowability.

☒ It is not necessary for applicant to provide a separate record of the substance of the interview, since the interview did not result in resolution of all issues. A brief summary by the examiner appears in Part II above.

/Susan Hanley/
 Examiner, Art Unit 1651

(Applicant/Applicant's Representative Signature – if appropriate)

Continuation of Substance of Interview including description of the general nature of what was discussed: Ex. Hanley informed Mr.Schulam that the response filed 11/17/10 was non-responsive due to a shift in the invention from the originally elected product claims to a method of using the product. The examiner gave Mr. Schulam the opportunity to file another response based on the originally elected invention. Mr. Schulman indicated that Applicant wanted the non-responsive amendment letter to be issued instead.